

cally for world competition; (2) enlarge Government subsidies, or (3) suffer a continued decline in both the merchant marine and the shipbuilding facilities that support it. Which of these alternatives the Kennedy administration will choose remains unclear.

In the filed of oceanography, Russia now leads the world. The U.S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries calls the Soviet Government's marine research a vast program and says that thousands of scientists and technologists are working for the All-Union Scientific Research Institute of Marine Fisheries and Oceanography. The research is coordinated by two large institutes at Murmansk and Vladivostok.

In simple terms of naval might, the United States still sails unchallenged on the seas, but Russia has built rapidly since World War II. The United States has 26 carriers on active duty. Russia has none, active or inactive. The United States has 240 destroyers to about 165 for Russia. But in other categories, Russia leads with 25 cruisers to 1 for the United States, 400 patrol-type craft to 70 in the active U.S. Fleet, and about 430 submarines to 118 U.S. subs. In addition, Russia maintains a flotilla of 500 motor torpedo boats, a few of which were sent to Cuba this summer. The United States no longer maintains the mosquito fleet that boosted President Kennedy to fame.

It is the huge Russian submarine force that worries American Navy strategists. Hitler opened World War II with only 57 U-boats, yet they scourged the sealanes and sank millions of tons of allied shipping. Should war break out today, Russia could fling more than 400 subs around the world to paralyze our merchant and warships. Though we lead Russia in the undersea missile-firing capability of the American Polaris submarines, it will be only a matter of a few years until the U.S.S.R. can threaten our inland cities with hydrogen-tipped missiles hurled from submarines hidden beneath the waves.

The duel between the submarine and the ships and planes that prey upon it is always a delicately balanced one, but right now, the submarine holds clear superiority. Nuclear power permits the sub to lurk beneath the surface for weeks. The Polaris-type missile gives it the hidden striking power of millions of tons of TNT.

Swift progress in antisubmarine warfare is a paramount task facing the U.S. Navy. Some admirals, indeed, believe it deserves the type of intense civilian-military cooperation found in the space program. Unless the answer is soon found, Russia's subs may some day take control of the seas without firing a shot.

Russia's bid for mastery on the high seas presents American leaders with an unwanted challenge; for, at the same time, the Soviet Union is racing for the upper hand in space. Yet the marine challenge is total—in merchantmen, in tankers, in research, in naval power, in fisheries and in shipbuilding. Whether Russia's seapower bid will be met in the sweeping fashion in which it has been made remains a question the Kennedy administration has yet to answer.

THE TYRANNY OF THE MINORITY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, under date of February 25, 1963, there appeared in the New York Times an editorial entitled "The Tyranny of the Minority." I believe that this subject should be brought to the attention of all Senators, as well as to thoughtful people throughout the country. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TYRANNY OF THE MINORITY

Those who dismiss as a capricious and meaningless waste of time the losing fight by Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, of Pennsylvania, to alter the size of and representation of committees of the Senate miss the point of a profoundly serious conflict. The real issue is not who will serve on which committees, and how they will be chosen, but rather whether the Senate—and the Congress as a whole—can be forced out of the path of obsolescence to which it is stubbornly adhering.

Essentially, the issue is this: The congressional committee structure as it has evolved over the last half century and more has inverted one of the basic concepts of democratic government—from rule of the majority to rule by a minority. This is a palpable fact of Congressional life today; it is not simply a slogan of liberal soreheads.

Command of the legislative process is in control of, comparatively speaking, a handful of legislators on the individual major committees of the House and Senate. More often than not, command is wielded not even by this small group but by the individual chairmen themselves.

The chairmen and/or the clique of committee seniors whom they control—usually a bipartisan clique—can and do withhold from floor consideration bills of which they personally disapprove. The devices for this arbitrary action are manifold: a chairman can simply pocket a bill referred to him and not bring it before his committee; he can kill it by the tactics of delay; he can kill it, or emasculate it, by the choice of witnesses brought in to testify on it. There are no really effective means of forcing a reluctant committee to act.

These chairmen and their cliques are fortified in their insouciance by the rule of seniority, and most of them in a Democratic Congress come from the safe and conservative districts of the South. In terms of Senator Clark's indictment, they represent the establishment. And in terms of the Kennedy administration, they represent the real as opposed to the titular opposition.

The question is not merely whether individual items on the Kennedy program will or will not be enacted by this Congress. The greater question is whether President Kennedy—or any President—can have his program submitted to the whole Congress to be tested fairly and expeditiously in the scales of majority rule.

The bicameral system was deliberately designed to check the tyranny of the majority. It was never designed to foster the tyranny of a minority. But this tyranny has been established through the evolution of the committee structure, and there it rests today, a wasting, corroding growth on our system of government.

THE WELFARE STATE AND THE WARFARE STATE

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, my colleague from Idaho, the distinguished senior Senator FRANK CHURCH, spoke recently at the University of Utah on "The Welfare State"—a subject not of his own choosing, but one on which he chose his words and arguments exceedingly well.

He pointed out that our present high Federal spending levels are not the result of the welfare state, but of what he called the warfare state. His eloquent and comprehensive treatment of this broad subject deserves widespread reading and consideration.

I ask unanimous consent that the excellent address made by Senator CHURCH at the University of Utah on February 23 of this year be carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The topic which has been assigned to me is "The Welfare State." Evidently, it is the gift of your committee in charge of persecuting guest speakers."

If the words, taken in the context of their current political usage, carried only their literal meaning, I would have no cause for complaint. Governments which are heedless of the welfare of the people usually fall to a violent death. The right of the people to overthrow such governments is one of the self-evident truths proclaimed by our own Declaration of Independence, while the affirmative obligation to promote the general welfare is listed among the express purposes for which the Federal Government was established, in the preamble to the Constitution of the United States.

But the term "welfare state" has come to connote something quite different from the wholesome concept of a government rightfully concerned about the welfare of its citizens. Extremists on the radical right use the phrase as a label for the villain in their well-oiled political spook show, now on the road from coast to coast. For them, "welfare state" means:

The do-gooders are at it again. They want the Government (meaning the Federal Government) to act as wet nurse for the whole population, from the cradle to the grave, insuring that every want is uniformly satisfied, and that the shiftless, the improvident, and the lazy are taken care of at the expense of the steady, the foresighted, and the energetic. They either don't know, or don't care, that to do this will destroy the fundamental qualities of character—known to the old frontier—which have made our country great. They are extracting, through ever-higher taxes, the good citizens' hard-earned money (which he can certainly spend for better purposes than the Government can devise) and they are doing it out to bad citizens.

In the process, the Government has become insolvent, the Nation has been brought to the brink of bankruptcy, and a monstrous bureaucracy has arisen which engulfs Congress and stretches its tentacles around the 50 States, slowly squeezing them to death. This bureaucracy, best typified by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, is dedicated to socialism, determined to destroy free enterprise, and undermine the liberties of the people. Further, it has been designed by the do-gooders as a means for perpetuating themselves in power by buying the votes of the no-gooders. Shades of the Roman circuses. And finally, we suspect these do-gooders are actually fellow-travelers whose purpose it is to so weaken the country from within that the Communists can take it over without ever firing a shot.

Now, if there are any among you who believe in this nightmare version of "the welfare state," this is little I can say to awaken you. I might just as well try to defend the Inquisition or medieval methods of torture.

So I must speak to the unspooked among you—to those of you who would rather pull the sheets off would-be ghosts than quail before them. With you, then, who are the open-minded and inquiring students, let me proceed to examine each of these hobgoblins, one by one.

To begin with, what accounts for the big Government we have in Washington today, and for the relatively high level of Federal taxation needed to support it? Take a look

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3541

of merchantmen, tankers, and in general shipbuilding, as well as in research and naval power.

Look magazine recently carried a comprehensive survey entitled "The Menace of Russia's Seapower," which was written by Fletcher Knebel. I ask unanimous consent that it be carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MENACE OF RUSSIA'S SEAPOWERS
(By Fletcher Knebel)

Soviet Russia, for centuries a giant land turtle, suddenly is striking out to sea with an agility and determination that surprise some U.S. military strategists and alarm others. While the eyes of the world have been focused on feats of rocketry in outer space, the Kremlin's orders have resulted in startling Communist progress in the far more familiar element of water. With its recent maritime surge little noticed save by marine experts, Russia now looms as a powerful bidder for supremacy on the high seas. The facts are not comforting:

Navy: The U.S.S.R. has passed Great Britain and now boasts the world's second largest war fleet, outranked only by that of the United States. Russia's 750,000-man Navy floats 25 cruisers, 165 destroyers, 430 submarines, including some missile-firing and atom-powered subs, 275 frigates, 500 motor torpedo boats, 900 minesweepers, a host of auxiliary craft and sizable shore-based naval aviation.

Merchant marine: Soviet freighters and tankers, their stacks decorated with the hammer-and-sickle emblem, now call at 60 major ports. Russia's merchant fleet continues to expand at an ever-growing pace, while that of the United States shrinks. Its 1,050 oceangoing merchant ships, totaling about 5 million deadweight tons, now rank Russia high on the list of maritime nations.

Fishing fleet: The Soviet Union operates the world's largest and most modern high-seas fishing fleet, with 3,000 ships plying all major fishing banks around the globe. The Russians now outfish U.S. commercial fishermen in waters off Cape Cod and Alaska and are even building a fishing port in Cuba. Many Soviet trawlers double as floating intelligence centers, with electronic and sonar gear collecting data on our radar installations, Pacific atom tests and shore defenses.

Shipbuilding: No nation is building more ships faster than the Soviet Union. In addition to a recent huge expansion of its Black Sea shipyards, Russia has more than 200 freighters, tankers and passenger-cargo ships on order in the free-world yards of Japan, Italy, Sweden, Finland, Denmark, and West Germany and also in the Communist-bloc yards of East Germany, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Poland. Smaller craft are even being built in landlocked Czechoslovakia. By 1980, Russia aims to have a 20 million-ton merchant fleet, matching or surpassing the commercial tonnage of Great Britain, now the merchant marine leader.

Oceanography: Russia already owns the largest and most modern marine-laboratory fleet afloat. Its 100-plus scientific vessels outnumber the 57 research ships operated by Government and private institutions in the United States. Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev has channeled some of Russia's best scientific brains into underwater research.

Marine technology: Russia is in the forefront of experimentation in design and gadgetry. A completely automated vessel recently made a trial run in the Black Sea. Some of the newest Soviet tankers can load or discharge oil with one man operating the automated console. Some freighters have closed-circuit TV for docking operations. Hydraulic hatches, an atom-powered icebreaker, hydro-

foil ships carrying passengers at 40 knots, gas turbine engines, 70,000-ton tankers, fiberglass hulls, all figure in the new face of Russia on the high seas. Like the United States and Britain, Russia is even experimenting with hovercraft vessels that never touch the waves.

While Russia's missile strength is far below that of the United States, as reported in the November 6 issue of Look, Russia's rise to sea power causes grave concern at the Pentagon. "The Soviets have built the world's second-largest navy since World War II," says Adm. George W. Anderson, Jr., Chief of Naval Operations, "and their merchant marine of smart, large, modern, clean ships is becoming a powerful tool for economic and political expansion."

"The trend alarms us," says Capt. D. A. Scott of the Navy's progress-analysis group. "It used to be a rare sight to see a Russian freighter. Now, two or three can be seen in almost every major port. It will be no surprise to see Russian warships maneuvering off Cape Henry (near Norfolk, Va.) in the years ahead."

"The Russians," said Assistant Secretary of the Navy Kenneth E. Belleu in a May speech, are moving "at flank speed to develop the sea-transport system they will need in order to pursue their goal of world domination. Most important of all, at this critical point in history, our own merchant fleet is declining in strength, versatility, and vigor, just when we appear to need them most."

Russia's new boldness on the high seas was flaunted under America's nose this summer when, within the space of a few weeks, the U.S.S.R. sent more than 60 ships into Cuba and unloaded heavy stores of tanks, weapons, motor torpedo boats, and even guided missiles. Only about half of the freighters that carried arms, Communist technicians and supplies to Castroland were Russian. Indeed, some of the chartered bottoms belonged to our Western allies.

There was no doubt in the minds of U.S. officials, however, that Russia could have sent the entire expedition in Russian hulls had Khrushchev so desired. The Soviet maritime fleet could have handled Operation Castro easily. It was speculated that the Kremlin chartered some free world ships primarily to embarrass the United States and to make any interference with the supply line diplomatically distasteful to this country. It would have been one thing to turn back an arms-laden Soviet ship from Havana Harbor, had the Kennedy administration the appetite for such a venture, but quite another to seize and search the vessel of a NATO member.

If Russia used the seas with audacity en route to Cuba, it was no less ambitious this spring in its invasions of U.S. fishing grounds off Cape Cod in the Atlantic and off Alaska in the Pacific. The Interior Department's Bureau of Commercial Fisheries in June tallied no less than 169 Soviet ships on Georges Bank, just east of Cape Cod, and 107 Communist fishing vessels in the gulf of Alaska. This record encroachment of almost 280 Red ships on traditional American fishing grounds represented a dramatic change in a short time. As recently as 1954, there were no sightings of Russian vessels off the east coast, and never until this year had Soviet fishing fleets ventured into the gulf of Alaska. This spring, two Russian vessels even tested fishing off North and South Carolina.

Soviet trawlers form formidable fishing fleets, with modern facilities and techniques far surpassing those in use by the United States. The Russian boats are fueled and serviced by repair ships, and transfer their catches to factory ships that process and pack the fish for market and to 19,000-ton mother ships that freeze them.

Many of the trawlers double as ocean intelligence agents, measuring American H-

boom tests in the Pacific, watching Atlantic naval maneuvers, pinpointing coastal radar beams and charting harbors, banks, and shoals along U.S. coasts. Navy patrol planes have pictured Russian trawlers bristling with electronic gear. Navy intelligence has learned that some trawlers carry scientific and espionage teams. American fishermen on infrequent visits aboard Russian trawlers have been barred from certain secret quarters. In 1960, the Russian trawler *Vega* had to be chased from its observation post by U.S. Navy ships. The *Vega* stood close by a Navy task force, including a nuclear *Polaris* submarine, during missile-firing tests off the east coast.

Along with its intelligence catch, Russia takes a tremendous quantity of fish from the ocean and has moved ahead of the United States in total annual catch. The United States now ranks fifth as a fishing nation, behind Japan, Red China, Russia, and Peru.

"The United States," Senator WARREN G. Magnuson, Democrat, of Washington, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, told the Senate in August, "has no mother ships, no factory ships, no stern-ramp trawlers, no refrigerated transport ships, no large fisheries vessels of any kind. No modern U.S. fishing fleet exists."

To help remedy the situation, MAGNUSON joined with two other Democratic Senators to sponsor bills offering larger construction subsidies for U.S. fishing boats and authorizing the Government to build two ultra-modern trawlers for pilot purposes.

It is perhaps ironic that the United States, with its historic pride in competitive free enterprise, finds itself being overtaken on the high seas by state-operated commercial fleets of a Communist power. It is even more ironic that Government subsidies are being proposed as the chief answer. But what is true of fishing vessels is also true of the merchant marine.

Russia's armada of merchant ships, crowned by glistening new tankers running up to 70,000 tons, has tripled since the opening of World War II and is expected to increase threefold again by the end of this decade. Before the war, Russia carried only 10 percent of its own trade in Soviet ships. Now, it carries about 60 percent of its trade, which has ballooned in volume. With more than 140 tankers in service and many more building, Russia powers a Communist oil offensive that is undercutting Western producers in a number of free world countries.

At the same time, our own merchant marine is dwindling. The active U.S. merchant fleet is contracting at the rate of 31 ships a year, according to the authoritative Marine Engineering Log. Our huge reserve fleet from World War II, while still largely intact, runs into obsolescence at river and harbor anchorages. Of the 907 active ships flying the U.S. flag, 300 belong to 16 lines that receive Government operating subsidy. Another 400 ships, aggregating almost 11 million tons, have gone under foreign flags of convenience or necessity, depending on the port of visit.

Early this year, Donald W. Alexander, the Maritime Administrator, urged a revolutionary approach to the American merchant marine in the face of "competition that could destroy it." He spoke of automated ships such as the Russians are building, and of assembly-line shipyards patterned after one in Sweden. Thus far, however, no general revolution in American methods has erupted, despite marked progress symbolized by such ships as the nuclear-powered cargo vessel, the *Savannah*, and the 100,500-ton tanker *Manhattan*.

Caught between high wages and high costs at home and foreign subsidies and state control abroad, American commercial shipping would appear to have three alternatives: (1) Slash operating costs and trim down drast-

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3543

at the Federal budget for 1963, and the answer is at once evident. Big Government on the Potomac is chiefly the product of warfare, not welfare. Over half the total budget goes directly to the Armed Forces.

In order to emphasize the magnitude of our military spending, allow me to relate it to something with which we are all familiar. We see, every day, impressive evidence of the effort and expense required for the education of our youngsters. In nearly every small town, in your State and mine, the largest buildings are the public schools. For every 25 or 30 youngsters, there is a full-time, professional educator. Teachers' salaries alone are a big chunk of the State and local taxes we must pay. Yet the Federal Government is spending, every year, for defense, more than treble the cost of all the educational programs in the country—including the school buildings themselves, the salaries of teachers and administrators, the books and supplies and lab equipment, the janitorial and upkeep services, light and heat, the gymnasiums and stadiums, down to the last football helmet and catcher's mitt. Three times as much. It is this tremendous expenditure, which we have had to sustain, almost without letup, for more than 20 years, that mainly accounts for the big Government in Washington today.

But, before you accuse me of telling only half the story, let's turn the Federal tax dollar over and have a look at the nonmilitary side. You may be surprised to find, on this side of the taxpayer's dollar, that most of the spending once again relates to warfare requirements, past and prospective, not to welfare programs. Our Space Technology, Atomic Energy, and Central Intelligence Agencies are all directly linked to our national security. The swollen costs of diplomacy and foreign aid, including military assistance to our allies, also relate to the security needs of the United States. Add these along with the continuing cost of our involvement in past wars, veterans' benefits and interest payments on the war debt, to what we spend each year on the armed forces, and the grand total accounts for a staggering 80 percent of all Federal spending.

This leaves 20 cents out of each Federal tax dollar still to be accounted for, much less than half of which goes to pay the costs of the Federal health, education, and welfare programs which lie at the heart of the controversy over "the welfare state." To be exact, 7 cents out of each taxpayer's dollar is all that is being spent by the Federal Government on welfare, which is a lesser percentage of our gross national product than the Government spent on welfare 25 years ago.

What are these welfare programs? They include Federal grants-in-aid to the States for aged, blind, and disabled citizens, and dependent children; Federal grants, usually given on a matching basis, for public health, hospital construction, water and sewage pollution, and food and drug administration. Also included are all forms of Federal aid to education, Federal impact funds, the school lunch program, vocational rehabilitation, and the special assistance to schools and students made available through the National Defense Education Act. Also the costs of administering unemployment compensation, policing of unions, and financing research for medical cures of cancer, heart disease, infantile paralysis, multiple sclerosis, and a host of other diseases of mind and body.

Meat-ax these programs, if you will, eliminate most of them in their entirety, and cut the remainder to ribbons, and you might save 5 percent on your Federal income tax—for such is the relative cost of all the welfare programs to the total cost of the Federal Government today. I submit that the Federal budget establishes, beyond question, that

big government on the national level, as we know it today, is the creature of the warfare state, not the welfare state.

Some of the other hobgoblins of the radical right, to which I earlier referred, can now be discarded with relative ease.

What about the burgeoning Federal bureaucracy spreading through every State and stifling the scope of State government? Actually, Federal employment no longer keeps pace with the growth of the country. In 1952, there were 16 Federal employees for every thousand of population. By 1958, this number had dropped to 14, and it will be 13 in fiscal 1964. In the decade from 1952 to 1962, total Federal civilian employment fell 3 percent, while employment by State and local governments increased by 63 percent. If creeping socialism is measured by the rising tide of government employees, the sentinels better station themselves closer to home.

What then of the hobgoblin of fiscal irresponsibility and imminent insolvency? Is the Federal Government spending itself into bankruptcy? The national debt, accumulated mainly through our participation in two world wars, is very large indeed. In 1947, at the close of World War II, the national debt exceeded our national wealth, as measured by the value of all the goods and services produced by the American people in that year. In 1963, though the debt had climbed still higher, our national wealth had doubled, and more. A person who has a \$10,000 income is in a better position to carry a \$5,000 debt than a person with a \$4,000 income. The same is true of a nation. Right after World War II, our national debt was nearly 130 percent of our GNP. Today it is just under 50 percent. In 1947, the national debt per person amounted to \$1,900. Today it is \$1,600. While we would all like to see the Federal debt reduced, our growing wealth has steadily improved our capacity to handle it, and the debt per person is substantially less today than at almost any time in the last 25 years.

I think you will find it of interest, also, that while the total debt of the Federal Government has increased by 15 percent since 1947, the aggregate debt of State and local governments has increased an astonishing 332 percent, in the total amount of \$66 billion. Private business debt has increased, in this same period, by \$271 billion, reflecting the tremendous expansion in all business activity. Again I must conclude that if deficit spending is the measure of fiscal irresponsibility, as most conservatives would have us believe, then the Federal Government is coming off best these days, when compared with either State and local governments, or with the private sector of the economy.

Now that we have put into somewhat better perspective some of the facts about our "welfare state," it is apparent that we are not dealing with such a monster as might first have been supposed. Most of the Federal giant's bulk is made up of muscles for our defense. He spends less of his income coddling us than he used to; he is not growing so fast as we are; and the lesser monsters at the State capital and the county seat are running us into debt faster than he is.

But he is big. Let us now ask ourselves how and why he got that way. Was it the result of some conscious conspiracy to concentrate power in Washington at the expense of the States? Was it the product of some alien doctrine? Was it really a plot for perpetuating politicians in office?

These questions seem to have some plausibility, because we tend to compare the size and scope of the Federal Government, in our time, with the limited role originally assigned to it by the Founding Fathers. We remind ourselves of Thomas Jefferson's famous admonition, "that government rules

best that rules least," overlooking the fact that the standard was meant to apply to the life and times of a rural and sparsely populated Colonial America. Nor was it wholly believed even then, for had it been, the Founding Fathers would hardly have spent that hot summer of 1787 in Philadelphia. They would have had no need to draft the Federal Constitution there. The Government established by the Articles of Confederation would have been quite adequate. It would have been, in fact, ideal, for one can hardly imagine a government which did less governing.

The men who lived in colonial times could not foresee the sweeping changes the future held in store for their infant country. They could not possibly have envisioned how our lives would be transformed by stampeding science, by mammoth industry, and by the burgeoning growth and urbanization of America.

Would Adam Smith recognize our free enterprise system today, where the classical capitalism of his time has been so largely supplanted by the corporate capitalism of ours?

Would Alexander Hamilton, who believed public affairs should be handled by an educated elite, the rich and well-born ever have thought it possible that his countrymen would come to adopt a system of socialized education, that is to say, a tax-supported universal system of free public schools?

What questions would George Washington be most apt to put to John F. Kennedy, if he could visit him today in the White House? Would he look out over the teeming city that bears his name, in and around which there are more people thickly settled than lived in all the country when he became our first President, and ask, "Why has the Government grown so large?"

I very much doubt it.

I think, rather, that he would look with wonder at the 35th President of the United States, whose jurisdiction extends from the Atlantic seaboard Washington knew, northward as far as the Arctic Circle and westward across a mighty continent and beyond as far as the mid-Pacific itself, and he would say to him, "Mr. President, how is it that our little Republic ever endured? Through all of this, what miracle has preserved a constitutional system we designed two centuries ago to meet the simple needs of 13 backwoods Colonies?"

I submit that our constitutional system has survived, because it has found the means to accommodate the changing needs of the people. The Federal Government has grown up with the country, and its role has expanded in order to protect the public interest in finding satisfactory solutions for the new problems thrust upon us by a highly industrialized payroll economy, dominated by gigantic corporations and equally gigantic labor unions, and increasingly characterized by the growing interdependence which results from congested urban life.

Today, Federal agencies regulate the rates which may be charged by railroads, trucking companies, airlines, electric and gas utilities, and telephone and telegraph companies. Others supervise the use of the airwaves to assure the orderly transmission of radio and television broadcasts. Still others see that certain drugs are not dispensed without a prescription, and that others are properly labelled, and that the public is not cheated by false advertising claims. All of these regulatory activities are connected in a certain way with our welfare; none of them presented a problem, for local, State, or National Government, when the Federal Union was first joined.

Why have we created, over a long period of time, a welfare state, at least to the extent of assigning these particular functions to the Federal Government? Isn't it

because the advances of science and industry, of trade and commerce, created novel problems unknown before, which were beyond the effective reach of State or local government, and which had to be solved in some way?

Can the airwaves be usurped without any kind of regulation in the public interest? If not, can the State of Utah stop a broadcast from Denver at the State boundary line? Can the State of Texas insure that consumers of natural gas in Illinois are not overcharged? I suggest these questions answer themselves.

We in the West, living in the less developed region of our country, have especially benefited from the expanded role of the Federal Government. To speed our development, we need the advantage of investment from without, investment of both private and public capital. Outside investment of public capital must come from the Federal Government, and its role has been of crucial importance to the growth of the West.

Take, for example, the interstate highway system, now under construction to meet the projected needs of the Nation's economy. Over 90 percent of the money is furnished through the Federal Government. In Idaho, some 85 percent of the money for our secondary highways and farm-to-market roads, comes from the Federal Government. In States like ours, where there are fewer than 10 persons per square mile, if the population were evenly spread over the area across which roads must be built, Federal money is essential to the construction of a modern road system. Without it, we would still be driving in the dirt.

And the same is true of much of the reclamation that causes our deserts to bloom. The Federal Government alone had the capital necessary to finance its great reclamation projects. Private sources could not furnish it, and neither could our State governments. Today, in Idaho, the Federal Government has begun the construction of a dam which will exceed the cost of the entire State budget for the next 2 years. Yet, the dam will be a sound investment; it will nourish our regional economy, and it will pay for itself, with interest, in 50 years. The point is, had we left such dams to the States to build, we might just as well have left them to the beavers.

Don't fool yourselves. The West has profited more from Federal investment than any other section of the country. More Federal money is today being spent in Utah, on a per capita basis, than any other State in the country. Yet you send to Congress a crop of candidates who say they are against this spending. Somehow, you have managed to have your cake and eat it too.

But if Congress has been willing, over the years, to expand the role of Federal investment in the West, it has been reluctant, on the whole, to extend the range of Federal intervention in the general economy. Fifteen million people stood in breadlines, in the dark, desperate days of the great depression, before Congress at last realized that our economy had outgrown effective local control, and required sufficient national regulation to police the nation's stock exchange, to stabilize the national banks, and to protect the people against the total collapse of the nation's business. Unemployment compensation, social security, minimum wage and hour laws, were then made the instruments of reform, as we began the long climb back to recovery.

Our own history is the basis for my contention that the Federal Government has grown bigger, assuming a larger role in the life of the people, not because anyone planned it that way, not in pursuit of any conspiracy to concentrate power on the Potomac, not, indeed, because any body of doctrine required it, but simply because the country grew and changed, problems arose

which existing machinery could not solve, and new ways were worked out, usually on a trial-and-error basis, to meet them. What I am saying is that we have not been doctrinaire, holding something to be good or bad as soon as some label could be affixed to it, but pragmatic, looking for the solution most apt to work, whatever it might be.

And I would say that the pragmatic method has served us well. Indeed, I would go further, and offer the judgment that it is a key source of strength and viability in the system we have evolved together for solving the problems of the 20th century.

Contrast it, if you will, to the approach to problem solving in Communist lands. It is there that dogma rules supreme. There it is supposed that one formula exists which offers the correct answer to every question; it is the fixed and final mold of a perfect society. When new problems arise, solutions are sought by searching the writings of the Communist prophets, and if one faction dislikes what another proposes, they attack it by saying that it is not in accordance with the principles of Marxist-Leninist doctrine. This straitjacket, since it leaves little room for change and adjustment, must eventually be torn asunder, by the inevitable pressures of new problems that cannot find solution within the rigid pattern of dogma handed down from an earlier, and much different, period.

This is why the best minds in the free world are confident that time is on our side in the struggle with communism, while it is the timid and the troubled among us, who seek the comfort of conformity, and want to solve all problems of the present by reciting the ritual slogans of the past, who fear that communism, being inflexible and disciplined by dogma, will soon overwhelm us.

You may accept it as the liberal view that neither the formulas of the radical left, nor those of the radical right, offer us acceptable blueprints for the future. This does not mean that we lack values, as some have rudely charged; it means only that we do not claim to be prophetic. We do not presume to know what the future holds, and so we strive, from day to day, to keep our society open and free, knowing that in this way we can continue to apply the same pragmatic test to the problems of the future, as has served us so well in the past.

This brings us to an examination of the last hobgoblin in the political spook-show version of the welfare state, with which I commenced this discourse, the familiar assertion that the huge Federal octopus is crushing our basic freedom. This question ought to be paramount in any appraisal of the larger role the Federal Government has come to play in our society.

Has the expanding activity of the Federal Government infringed upon the freedom of the individual? If by freedom one means the bundle of individual rights guaranteed to each citizen by the Federal Constitution, then there is no evidence to support the charge. The whole movement of our history has been in the direction of enlarging the bundle: slavery has been abolished, women's suffrage has been won, the many restrictions that once made voting the privilege of the propertied few, have been steadily sloughed away. The complaints I get about current decisions of the Supreme Court are not to the effect that the Court is giving too little attention to the rights of the individual, but too much.

I confess I most often hear the cry that our freedom is being lost, in some sumptuous living room or beside some sparkling private swimming pool. In this setting, it is usually a fancy way of saying, "Taxes are too high." Now, despite the fact that our free enterprise system seems to be surviving the heavy burden of taxes it carries, I agree that a tax cut would very likely stimulate our economic growth and further reduce un-

employment. I wish conditions in the world were such as might permit us to cut taxes massively. But as long as external danger forces us to hold up the heavy shield of a warfare state, massive tax cuts will not occur.

Nevertheless, I must remind you that, over the past decade, the trend in Federal taxes has been moderately downward, while the trend in State and local taxes has been sharply up. In 1953, the Federal income tax was reduced 10 percent, and the rates will probably be reduced again in this session of Congress. During the same period, in my own State of Idaho, per capita taxes increased by more than 100 percent.

Still, candor obliges me to acknowledge, that neither this disposal of the question of taxes, nor the spreading scope we are giving to individual rights under the Constitution, quite suffices to remove the lingering doubt that somehow our freedom is being impaired. This is an emotion many people share. Again I suggest it may spring from traditional and historic roots.

The ideal of freedom which motivated the founders of our Republic was based upon a way of life that has long since disappeared. The social and economic order they knew and valued was founded on land ownership. They envisioned a society of freeholders, each producing on the land nearly everything he and his family needed, and consuming nearly everything produced. They conceived that the independence, industry, and self-reliance of these farmer-freeholders, supplemented by a small minority of equally independent craftsmen and artisans, would yield a maximum of freedom. In such a society, there was need for only a minimum of government, which was suspect anyway, owing to the tyranny of the King. The natural attitude was to hold government down, permit no interference with freedom of speech and religion, insure fair and orderly judicial proceedings, keep the tax collector away, and all will be well. This early concept of freedom remains very much a part of our birthright.

We westerners have nurtured an even more windswept notion of freedom, drawn from the legend and romance of the old frontier. We recall the mountain men who roamed the vastness of the West in the early days. Here indeed was freedom. The mountain man needed only his rifle and his knife, the wide, empty world to live in, and to be left alone—and he had all these things. By himself he wrested from the wilderness what he needed for food, for clothing, and for shelter. True, he knew nothing of books or finery; he was often cold and hungry; and if he got sick, he usually lived or died alone. But he was as free as the wild animals he preyed upon.

Now, the modern man, who works for wages in a factory or an office, or who tractors a big spread of land on which he grows only wheat or potatoes, is both more and less free than his mountain predecessor and the self-sufficient freeholder of the 18th century. In some ways, he is a wheel within a wheel within a wheel, pulling the same lever on an assembly line, or bearing the same leather dispatch case, full of papers, which is one of those status symbols of the organization man. He has come to need many things which his ancestors didn't even know about, and couldn't possibly have imagined. He is hemmed in by laws and regulations, and he pays taxes.

In exchange, his life is longer, fuller, and easier. He is literate, and if he avails himself of the opportunity, he may know the pleasures of good books, good music, and good drama. He has leisure time for travel and recreation, and he can readily know much about what goes on in the big world around him. If he is taken sick, there are doctors, nurses, and well-equipped hospitals to care for him. Wherever he may live, he can easily stay in touch with

ability of domestic fuels and fuels transportation to meet the demands of national security is just as true now as it was when the control program was established.

I am in complete agreement with this statement, as well as the following one in the letter to the President:

The coal, railroad, and related industries, and those millions of people dependent directly and indirectly upon them for a livelihood, urgently need assurances that the residual import control program will be retained and strengthened. There must be a certainty that reasonable controls will be in effect for a period of several years and that the program will be administered in a realistic manner. Import quotas should permit imported oil to share in the increase in the Nation's total fuel needs, but not to fill all of the increasing demand, as has been the case in recent years.

The Office of Emergency Planning report has not only alarmed the coal industry but also domestic oil producers because the report declared that the Nation should not depend on resources within its own borders for security. They interpret this statement to mean that the report's author sees no justification for retaining import restrictions on crude petroleum and products, as well as residual oil.

I feel strongly that if the Office of Emergency Planning, Interior, and other Government agencies are unable to solve the residual oil import problem to the satisfaction of the domestic coal and oil industries, then it will be up to the Congress to do so.

The friendship of Venezuela and support of its Government against Communist pressures is greatly to be desired. I do not believe that it is necessary to wreck the economy of our coal-producing States to retain this friendship.

AFRICAN STUDENTS IN BULGARIA

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the startling exodus of a number of African students from Bulgaria points up vividly the fact that the Communists have stumbled over their own shortcomings in wooing students from the developing nations. The students' disenchantment with conditions in Bulgaria—the racial discrimination, active segregation, and overt Communist indoctrination—demonstrates once again the imperfections of the Communist world, which has boasted so often of its racial tolerance.

Now we are faced with the very real problem of our own reaction to this situation. In a true sense, the challenge is to our own responsibility. We have been meeting it to a large degree, as the statistics point out quite clearly. Students from non-European nations presently studying in the West number well over 120,000, whereas those in the Eastern bloc countries are less than one-sixth; in number, approximately 18,000. The United States has been carrying a large share of this burden. We are taking 43,000 students of the 120,000 total; 8,277 from the Near and Middle East; 21,568 from the Far East; and 9,915 from Latin America. This is a significant share of the total. Can and will we go beyond it?

A group of young American students have reacted to the situation in a manner that must surely make us proud.

The Brown University African Students Committee, comprised of David A. Lovenheim, Alan I. Brenner, Jonathan Kagan, Jeffrey Liss, and David London, has organized a drive to finance the education of at least one qualified African student who has fled from Bulgaria. These students gathered over 1,600 petitioners in support of such a move. Even more commendable is the fact that they have raised more than \$3,000 by private contributions to pay the educational expenses of any student brought over. I am told that the president of Brown University, Barnaby Keeney, has responded to this student effort by pledging a dollar for dollar matching grant toward tuition costs. And I am informed that any contribution to the university for this project is eligible for matching funds on a one for two basis under the Ford Foundation challenge grant program.

Mr. Lincoln White, the State Department press officer, stated on March 1 that his department is coordinating its activities through the Institute of International Education. An official of this organization is being sent to Europe to interview these African students with a view toward determining which are eligible for admission to American universities and colleges, and which institutions have room and offer the curriculum these students are interested in. His findings may lead to the selection of students who are qualified to respond to Brown's generous offer.

Brown University in Rhode Island is the first American college to undertake such a project. The student committee, the student body as a whole, and the faculty has responded to the challenge in a spirited and positive fashion. They have set the guidelines, and they are to be much commended. I would hope that other American colleges will make this a nationwide effort so that, unlike the Communist nations, we may be judged by our sincere efforts.

HOSPITALIZATION FOR MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, recently my attention was directed to the fact that there is an omission in the law relative to veterans benefits to recipients of the Medal of Honor Award.

I became aware of this omission for the first time when Mr. Gene W. Rossman, the very capable Executive Director of the Housing Authority of Portland, Oreg., wrote to inform me that an Oregon resident, Mr. Jacob Volz, who was awarded the Medal of Honor in 1911, is in urgent need of hospitalization and medical care and is without funds to defray the expenses of such care.

As soon as I learned of Mr. Volz' problem, I directed an inquiry to Administrator Gleason, of the Veterans' Administration, and asked for full information concerning the possibility of obtaining help for Mr. Volz through the facilities of the Veterans' Administration. The report I received from Mr. Gleason was most discouraging. It indicated that Mr. Volz did not incur a disability in the line of duty and that he did not receive service-connected injuries which would

entitle him to receive disability compensation.

Mr. Rossman was informed of the information supplied by the Veterans' Administration, and in response he told me that Mr. Volz' case is one involving great urgency, calling for the immediate service of a doctor and hospital care. Mr. Rossman added:

If this man is allowed to die for lack of VA medical and hospital care, it will serve as a sad commentary on the meaning of the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Because of the persuasive nature of Mr. Rossman's comments, I asked Administrator Gleason to review Mr. Volz' case and to provide me with the draft of a bill designed to provide medical and hospital assistance under the program of the VA for recipients of the Medal of Honor. The Administrator supplied a draft which I intend to introduce today in slightly amended form.

Mr. President, in my opinion it is unthinkable that a member of our Armed Forces who has performed outstanding acts of valor and who demonstrated his willingness to sacrifice his life for his country, should be deprived of medical and hospital benefits in the closing years of his life. I feel that a veteran who has thus demonstrated his love for his country should, in turn, have some help from his country when that help is needed most urgently.

Jacob Volz' valor, in the service of his country, is beyond question. His Medal of Honor certificate recites that the Medal of Honor was awarded to him "on the 13th day of December 1911, for service while attached to the U.S.S. *Pampang* during action against the Moros on the island of Basilan, Philippine Islands, on September 24, 1911. Volz was one of a shore party moving in to capture Mundang."

At my request, the Department of the Navy supplied further details concerning Jacob Volz' outstanding acts of courage. The Department stated:

While attached to the U.S.S. *Pampang*, Volz was one of a shore party moved in to capture Mundang, on the island of Basilan, Philippine Islands, on September 24, 1911. Investigating a group of Nipa huts close to the trail, the advance scout party was suddenly taken under point blank fire and rushed by approximately 20 enemy Moros attacking from inside the huts and other concealed positions. Volz responded instantly to calls for help and finding all members of the scout party writhing on the ground but still firing, he blazed his rifle into the outlaws with telling effect, destroying several of the Moros and assisting in the rout of the remainder. By his aggressive charging of the enemy under heavy fire and in the face of great odds, Volz contributed materially to the success of the engagement.

Jacob Volz ably displayed his courage and valor and clearly demonstrated his willingness to serve far above and beyond the call of duty. The fact that the United States was not technically at war in 1911, in my opinion, is immaterial. The important point is that Volz engaged in the kind of heroism of the same magnitude as heroic acts that are performed by our military forces in time of war.

We have an obligation to our valiant men who have received the Medal of Honor, and I believe this obligation extends to providing medical and hospital

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD --- SENATE

3545

his parents or grandparents, children or grandchildren. And he is conscious, if he ever stops to think about it, that his fellow-men, whether they are engaged in chipping away at the malignant mysteries of cancer, or giving penicillin to the diseased children of Africa, or probing the alien darkness of outer space, are being sustained, in part, by the product of his labor.

Who is to say whether freedom has been gained or lost through the upheaval of science and industry that has so changed the character of our lives? The form of the free life known to the old frontier is disappearing, and there is no way to recapture it. Of this, I am sure. We stand upon what President Kennedy has chosen to describe as a New Frontier. It is a time of peril and of promise for the human race. Science has given us the tools to either cinderize the earth in the witchfire of nuclear war, or make of it man's footstool to the stars.

God only knows what our fate is to be. But on this earth He has left our destiny in our hands. We can best prepare for it, by facing the future, by recognizing that our welfare state, as we know it today, has been fashioned by the effort of free men to regulate their affairs in response to the needs of the changing times. Let the process continue, for it cannot be stopped. And let us pray that it will be directed, in the future as it has in the past, by unbigoted and pragmatic men, who have no fear of hobgoblins, and who are dedicated to the everlasting quest of keeping our society open and free.

DR. HOWARD R. DRIGGS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, one of Utah's most illustrious sons, Dr. Howard R. Driggs, died recently in New York City at the ripe old age of 89, and made the long trip back to his hometown of Pleasant Grove for his final resting place.

The author of more than 50 books on western pioneer life, Dr. Driggs was clear minded and hearty up to his last years, publishing "Money Rock, a Drama of the Pony Express," in 1960.

He was a supervisor of English at the University of Utah School of Education from 1906 to 1912, and later served as English education chairman at New York University. In this post he was one of the first educators in the country to use radio in the classroom.

During all of the years he was teaching he was also writing about the part of the country which was his first love—the West. Among his best known books were "Red Feather," "Deadwood Gold," "The Pioneer Life," "The Rise of the Lone Star," and "Westward America." He also edited and produced the "American Trails" film series.

The Ogden Standard Examiner and the Salt Lake Tribune both carried brief but eloquent editorials on Dr. Driggs and his contribution to America, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Standard Examiner, Feb. 19, 1963]
HISTORIAN H. R. DRIGGS

Utah's Howard Roscoe Driggs is one man who definitely will go down in American history.

Definitely because Howard Driggs wrote many of the best histories of the western part of our Nation.

Mr. Driggs, who died Sunday at 89, was the author of 20 books of his own and coauthor of 12 more. The Pleasant Grove, Utah, native taught history and English 45 years before his retirement in 1942 as professor emeritus of English education at New York University.

When he was graduated in 1897 from the University of Utah, Howard Driggs was named "class poet." In the 86 active years that followed his graduation, he was more than a poet although his writings had the "ring" of fine poetry.

Howard Driggs in his full life contributed greatly to the understanding of the West—past, present and future.

[From the Salt Lake Tribune]

DR. HOWARD R. DRIGGS

American awareness of the role of the West in U.S. history is largely due to the work of scholars like Dr. Howard R. Driggs, who died in New York Sunday at the age of 89.

Dr. Driggs, professor emeritus of English education at New York University, devoted much of his time, especially since retirement 21 years ago, to collecting and publishing the stories of western pioneers. He wrote more than a score of books and was coauthor of a dozen. His last work was "Money Rock, a Drama of the Pony Express," which appeared in 1960.

But it was probably as president of the American Pioneer Trails and Landmarks Association that Dr. Driggs had the greatest impact in bringing the history of the West to the attention of the Nation. He edited and produced films for the association until shortly before his death, and he was widely known as a speaker on such subjects as the Utah handcart pioneers. His constant theme was that a country's true wealth is based upon the character and heritage of its people.

Many honors came to Dr. Driggs, among them election to the Western Hall of Fame. He was respected and admired as an educator, scholar, and historian. He was an outstanding citizen whose death will be mourned across the Nation. The Tribune joins in saluting the memory of this eminent son of Utah, who will be laid to rest this week at Pleasant Grove where he was born in 1873.

U.S. RESIDUAL FUEL OIL IMPORT POLICY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, Utah and other coal-producing States of the Nation, asking only fair treatment in the marketplace and a reasonable and stable oil import policy for long-range planning, are worse off already in 1963, than last year.

On January 30, 1963, Secretary of Interior Udall announced an increase of 6.5 million barrels of imported residual oil for the remainder of the quota year. This meant an increase of 108,000 barrels daily during the months of February and March 1963. This blow, deflected by the Interior Department on the basis of cold weather and unexpected decline in domestic production, had an effect on the coal industry comparable to throwing pails of water in the face of a drowning man.

Already economically sick from excessive residual oil imports, the coal-producing areas of the country had better brace themselves for a possible knockout punch. The recommendation of the Office of Emergency Planning to relax import controls on residual oil sets the stage for the momentous decision as to

the level of imports in the coming quota year beginning April 1. U.S. dollars to Venezuelan doughnuts, the decision may be the bitterest pill the coal industry ever has been obliged to swallow. The betting is on President Betancourt of Venezuela to score another victory for his country's oil economy over the economy of the coal- and oil-producing States of our country.

Utah produces about 5 million tons of bituminous coal annually, with a coal industry payroll estimated at over \$10 million. The value of production of Utah coal runs to more than \$30 million. The coal industry employs about 2,200 persons. Utah's railroad industry benefits from hauling coal. In 1961 the estimated railroad revenue derived from Utah coal shipments was \$15,994,000.

Just think how these figures would skyrocket if the Federal Government should adopt a policy of promoting the coal industry on equal terms with atomic energy, for example, not to mention imported residual oil and the sales of inter-uptible gas.

Utah possesses close to 14 billion net tons of recoverable reserves of coal, assuming 50 percent recovery. Other States possess even greater volumes of reserves. The United States has sufficient coal reserves to keep our vast industrial machine going for many centuries.

However, the coal industry of Utah and other coal producing States apparently is not going to get much sympathy or help from Washington.

For some reason, which I am unable to fathom, the administration has turned its back on the American coal miner in a time of danger to the national security. The American coal miner has never let this country down in wartime or any other emergency.

One does not have to be a military expert to perceive that the present government of Venezuela is living under a continuing threat imposed by Castro. Oil wells are blown up, the power supply dynamited and ships are hijacked by the Communists.

In time of war, and if Russia intervenes, the east coast fuel supply certainly would be jeopardized.

Oblivious to the risks and perils of depending upon a foreign fuel in these days of crisis in the Caribbean, there are loud voices from New England clamoring for more and more residual oil and actually demanding an end to import quota restrictions of any kind.

I am sure that just about any major coal producing States that could be named, but more products of New England manufacturing plants than does Venezuela. I am sure that the United States will never solve its balance-of-payments problem if it relies upon Venezuela to buy as much or more from us than we buy from her.

On February 7, 1963, 102 Members of the House of Representatives signed a letter to the President of the United States. They told the President:

It is our firm conviction that controls on imports of residual oil must not only be retained but they must also be strengthened and made effective. The close correlation between excessive residual imports and the